REMARKS

Amendment of Title

The title of the instant application is amended to match that on the filing papers and formal documents.

Correction of the 371(c) Filing Date and the Title

Applicants would like to bring the following into the Examiner's attention.

On January 25, 2007, the instant application published as U.S. Pat. App. Pub. US 2007/0021465. The US 2007/0021465 indicates that the 371(c) date is July 15, 2006 and that the title of the instant invention is "Anti-inflammatory Compounds".

With respect to the 371(c) date, Applicants have filed a Request for Corrected Filing Receipt and Notice of Acceptance on October 23, 2006. Corrected Filing Receipt was mailed by the USPTO on May 8, 2008.

With respect to the title of the invention, Applicants now introduce the correct title by way of the present amendment.

Reply to Restriction Requirement

The Examiner restricted the pending claims into two groups:

- Group I, Claims 1-21, drawn to a chemical compound of formula (I) and a pharmaceutical composition comprising same; and
- Group II, Claims 30-44, drawn to a method of treating a subject having the recited disorders, the method comprising administering to the subject a compound of formula (I).

Additionally, the Examiner required selection of a single disclosed species for the purposes of search and examination: a single species of a compound and, if the elected group is Group II, a single species of a disorder.

Responsive to the restriction requirement, Applicants hereby elect the invention of Groups I (Claims 1-21, directed to a chemical compound of formula (I)) for further prosecution. Responsive to the requirement for the election of species, Applicants hereby select the compound of formula (VII):

Claims readable on the elected species are Claim 1-8, 10-18 and 20.

Applicants reserve the right to file a continuing application or take such other appropriate action as deemed necessary to protect the non-elected inventions. Applicants do not hereby abandon or waive any rights in the non-elected inventions.

With respect to the restriction of pending claims into Groups I and II, Applicants remind the Examiner that, under the established law and rules, if the product claims of Group I are found allowable, withdrawn method of use claims of Group II that include all the limitations of the allowable claims must be rejoined, the requirement for restriction must be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims must be fully examined. See In Re Ochiai, 71 F. 3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995), In Re Brouwer, 730 F. 3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1995), and M.P.E.P. § 821.04(b).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By /Alexander Akhiezer, Reg. No. 54,617/ Alexander Akhiezer

Registration No. 54,617 Telephone: (978) 341-0036 Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133 Date: July 14, 2009